

ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES OF WORK SESSION
May 4, 1995

FACILITATOR: Reed Hodgins, AlphaTRAC

Eugene DeMayo called the meeting to order at 6 p.m.

BOARD/EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Alan Aluisi, Chuck Clark, Ralph Coleman, Tom Davidson, Eugene DeMayo, Gislinde Engelmann, Tom Gallegos, Kathryn Johnson, Jack Kraushaar, Albert Lambert, Beverly Lyne, David Navarro, Gary Thompson / Martin Hestmark, Steve Tarlton, Joe Wienand

BOARD/EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT: Lorraine Anderson, Stuart Asay, Jim Burch, Jan Burda, Lloyd Casey, Linda Murakami / Tom Marshall, Leanne Smith

PUBLIC/OBSERVERS PRESENT: Sujit Gupta (E/WM Committee); Chris Dayton (Kaiser-Hill); LizBeth Cone (ASG); Michael Konczal (DOE/RFFO); Sasa Jovic (citizen); Ann Moss (Shapins Assoc.); George Martelon (RFFO/SAIC); Nancy Hartman (citizen); W. H. Diment (citizen); Teresa Mikulsky Purcell (SAIC); Carl Mitcham (Colorado School of Mines); Kay Ryan (Parsons Brinckerhoff); James W. Bond (citizen); Gerald Sullivan (citizen); Nelson Bock (citizen); Shelly Whittle (citizen); Benton Howell (citizen); Julie Yee (citizen); Josh Keesy (citizen); Bob Dudley (citizen); Carrie Jo Saunders (citizen); Ann Sieben (Kaiser-Hill); Brenda Fosmire (citizen); Tom Clark (citizen); Cheryl Arnold (WSI); DeAnne Butterfield (RFLII); O. B. Spence (citizen); Mike Freeman (E/WM Committee); Catherine Conn (RMRS)

DOE COMPREHENSIVE SITE USE PLAN BRIEFING (Bob Vineski, DOE): This Future Site Use Document will describe purpose, public process, options, and a vision for action. It is being developed to provide information on future use options to RFETS management, stakeholders, local government, regulators, and DOE headquarters. The future use options fall into three phases that make up the plan: Phase 1: Plutonium is stored on site; Phase 2: After plutonium and backlog wastes are removed and cleanup is underway; Phase 3: Initial cleanup complete. It is anticipated the document will be finalized and ready to present to DOE headquarters by November 30, 1995.

Q/A to Briefing:

Question: This document is obviously produced by DOE rather than the Future Site Use Working Group - why was that route chosen as opposed to taking what the working group came up with?

Answer: DOE will produce information like the process and historical information, but the recommendation of the working group will provide the meat of the document - an outside consensus of regulators, local governments, etc.

Question: I think the working group members are under the impression that they will produce a document that will be used directly.

ADMIN RECORD

SW-A-005283

3/7/2006

Answer: We will submit that document directly, but we have to prepare a more comprehensive look at the site, including a more comprehensive approach to what will happen. We have to build more of a document to satisfy DOE headquarters than just the recommendation by the working group. The recommendation is the cornerstone of the document.

FUTURE SITE USE REPORT DISCUSSION AND FEEDBACK (facilitated by Alan Aluisi):

The final version of this document will be issued around June 8. The recommendation will be the first major sitewide decision on this issue. In order to keep on time line and with performance goals, this must be completed by July. Comments will be accepted through June 20, and will be forwarded to the working group. A recommendation for approval will be brought before CAB at its July meeting.

Round-robin comments on Future Site Use Working Group Draft Plan:

- Concern about the uncertainty of dates in the time line.
- QAT has developed time lines; these can be shared with working group.
- Time line for Phases 1-3 is too long; plutonium can be moved sooner.
- If FSUWG doesn't agree with the time line, they should tell DOE in their recommendations.
- This plan does not mention on-site disposal; I support limited on-site disposal.
- Cleanup levels should be based on health risks and costs; background is too stringent, too expensive, not feasible.
- How clean is clean must be determined; look closely at costs.
- Would like to see tracking of cleanup progress; this would help people to be able to put pressure on the government to live up to commitments and clean it up.
- Concerned about contamination in soil and effects on people using land when it is open space.
- Is it realistic to clean up trace amounts of contamination in the soil? It might not be.
- You need to determine how big a buffer should be for the materials that are on-site.
- There must be a process for checks and balances; need to include monitoring of cleanup and contamination all the way through each phase.
- Report by the FSUWG is very well-written and they obviously have done a lot of good work.
- Background levels may be an unrealistic goal.
- I am very concerned with cleanup because I own land two miles away. We must be careful about future contamination because of all the plutonium and uranium stored on-site.
- Make sure we have baseline information on contamination now to determine if or how much contamination occurs during cleanup.
- Consider a reality check on budgets and available technology; don't preclude the possible benefits of future technology developments.

Public comment: At Hanford, they found mutated plant species on their land. Are you going to check for the same here? If could affect your future use decisions. [Provided some information from the Nature Conservancy.]

ROCKY FLATS SUMMIT FOLLOW-UP:

Recommendation: Support for priorities developed at the Rocky Flats Summit.

Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED.

FY 96 BUDGET REALLOCATION DISCUSSION/FEEDBACK (facilitated by

Gislinda Engelmann): DOE is planning to defer about \$58.7 million in environmental restoration cleanup projects in order to reallocate the funds toward focusing on addressing high risk problems, such as plutonium stabilization and consolidation of special nuclear materials. EPA and CDPHE have placed conditions on moving environmental restoration funds to high risk activities. The Site Wide Issues Committee is reviewing DOE's plan, and is requesting CAB members comment.

Round-robin comments on budget reallocation discussion:

- There needs to be accountability for the deferment of the funds; there needs to be a better plan for what will happen to the money.
- This is a good idea if EPA and CDPHE qualifications and conditions are met.
- Can we really be sure the funding won't be pulled away by headquarters?
- DOE agrees with the conditions made by EPA and CDPHE; will meet with Tom Grumbly to discuss.
- No question that we need to focus on stabilization and consolidation; do not agree with DOE's proposal to consolidate into one building - perhaps analyze using more than one building. [Use of one building is only a planning assumption - no final decision has yet been made.]
- Would be interesting to view the fiscal year budgets in relation to the next presidential election.
- Interested in the total cost of the stabilization - what part does the \$58 million play in the total? Will it have to be done year after year - or be incremental?
- Everyone would agree that taking care of the plutonium is the most important thing, but the goal should be to consider moving materials away from Rocky Flats.
- This plan highlights priorities established at Summit - reducing the mortgage, taking care of the plutonium and making it safer.
- Is this deferment also for FY 97? [Haven't agreed to that yet.]

Public comment: DOE personnel is now highest on-site in history - since DOE wants to cut and consolidate, it might consider cutting personnel to save money and put it into environmental restoration. [DOE/RFFO is proposing cuts in travel, support services, etc.]

Public comment: What portion of the people at Rocky Flats are actually engaged in cleanup? [Specific numbers are available; need to contact Joe Wienand.]

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- For reimbursement of travel expenses through March 31, turn in forms to Deb Thompson by May 15.
- Next Board retreat is scheduled all day on Sunday, June 25 (location to be determined later) - this is a regular, mandatory Board meeting.

Recommendation: Approve Kathryn Johnson to serve as co-chair of the Community Outreach Committee.

Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED.

- Alternative Use Planning Committee will meet next on Tuesday, May 23, 6:30 p.m. at the CAB office - Board members interested in helping to develop future use policy are encouraged to attend.
- Agencies are completing discussion on the Cleanup Agreement. CAB may wish to consider making comment on the document sometime prior to August. The agreement will be reviewed by Kaiser-Hill prior to finalization.
- David Navarro discussed the press release by DOE regarding privatization of services at Rocky Flats, including the Health Physics Instrumentation Lab, services for asbestos characterization and abatement, and filter test facility. This privatization will

displace current workers, both union and non-union. Although announced today, the decision was made April 14. There have been three opportunities for DOE to share this information since that time, but it was not shared with the public.

BUDGET BRIEFING (Beverly Lyne Wilber): Beverly gave an overview of budget and finances for calendar year 1994 [revenue = \$247,506.74; expenses = \$203,064.25]. Start-up phase of funding was 15 months through AIP with CDPHE. This year's funding (nine-month budget) of approximately \$296,000 is through a direct grant with DOE. It is hoped that next year's grant (full-year budget) will be directly with DOE-HQ; budget will be developed this summer. Beverly also detailed a list of fiscal accomplishments to date.

CAB SPONSORSHIP OF PUBLIC MEETING: The Institute for Energy and Environmental Research has proposed having their director conduct a public meeting to discuss vitrification of plutonium and special nuclear materials. CAB, Rocky Mountain Peace Center, American Friends Service Committee, Physicians for Social Responsibility and Sierra Club have been asked to sponsor the meeting. There may be costs to CAB of approximately \$200. The meeting will be held at Westminster City Hall, Council Chambers on Tuesday evening, June 6.

Recommendation: Approve CAB sponsorship of public meeting to discuss vitrification of plutonium and special nuclear materials. There were concerns expressed that sponsorship of this meeting should not imply that CAB specifically endorses vitrification. It was explained that the purpose of the public meeting is to receive information and discuss the issue - not endorsement.

Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED.

SITE WIDE ISSUES COMMITTEE WORK PLAN PRESENTATION (Gislinde Engelmann): The committee has determined the main issues it will address include residue stabilization, waste disposal policy, and the budget process and Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement. The committee will forward recommendations to CAB on: treatment of residues; off-site disposal at WIPP; whether Rocky Flats should receive off-site waste for treatment and storage; and budget/RFCA issues. The committee will develop position papers on: long-term storage standards for residues; WIPP; and length of on-site storage of wastes received at RF.

Comments on Site Wide Issues Committee Work Plan:

- Waste disposal policy should be addressed by other committees as well - this is also a focus of the Environmental/Waste Management Committee. Committees need to work with each other on overlapping issues.

ENVIRONMENTAL/WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE WORK PLAN PRESENTATION (Tom Gallegos): Areas the committee will focus on include: liquid stabilization; accelerated cleanup; solar ponds closure; on-site disposal of mixed waste; analysis of remediation/treatment technologies; and "how clean is clean." A recommendation to CAB on closure of solar ponds has been completed. Position papers will be prepared on: liquid stabilization (tank draining); Accelerated Cleanup Program (ER2000); on-site disposal of mixed waste; and "how clean is clean." Tracking of each issue will be ongoing. The committee will provide comments on the Proposed Site Treatment Plan, and perform a technology assessment. Key action items are: 1) develop and compose a waste disposal policy for CAB to adopt; 2) develop and compose a cleanup levels policy for CAB to adopt; 3) designate a point of contact/lead for each work plan area

to coordinate information and project activities; and 4) develop a standard template for DOE project contacts outlining committee information exchange requirements for projects/programs.

Comments on Environmental/Waste Management Committee Work Plan:

- Same as with Site Wide Issues Committee: all committees need to work with each other on overlapping issues.

ALTERNATIVE USE PLANNING COMMITTEE WORK PLAN PRESENTATION

(Alan Aluisi): Work plan topics include: analyze issues related to deactivation and decommissioning of buildings; provide input on Rocky Flats future site use; analyze and recommend Board policies related to economic development; and identify any Board policies related to site employment. Recommendations will include: criteria and scope for mortgage reduction; input on DOE's D&D prioritization criteria; "lessons learned" from D&D pilot projects; endorsement/modification of FSUWG report; CAB policy on acceptable economic uses of RF site; stage 3 of NCPP; and a statement of support for retaining qualified workers at the site. The committee will also: 1) provide comments on DOE's Comprehensive Site Use Plan; 2) track progress of NCPP; and 3) track and recommend comment on private uses of RF buildings.

Comments on Alternative Use Planning Committee Work Plan:

- Regarding support for retaining workers - with union workers it's more complicated as they have seniority issues. The seniority process will prevail; there is no way to circumvent it.

WORK PLAN PRIORITIZATION (Lisa Hanson): Committees developed issues, and staff consolidated the issues and projects into one list. The list is categorized by major decision issues that need to be addressed first. Issues in priority level one are broad decisions that CAB needs to come to agreement on before it can tackle issues under the other priority levels. Committee co-chairs agree that these are the most important priorities. Staff proposes that CAB approve these issues as the most important, and have committees address them as top priority. Those priorities and possible committee assignments are as follows: 1) Cleanup Levels [Environmental/Waste Management Committee]; 2) Waste Disposal Policy [Site Wide Issues Committee]; 3) Plutonium Disposition [Plutonium and Special Nuclear Materials Committee]; and 4) Future Use [Alternative Use Planning Committee]. Co-chairs recommend that each committee develop an action plan/approach for how CAB should deal with these issues, and present it to CAB at June 25 retreat.

Comments on CAB Work Plan Prioritization:

- CDPHE: These are major issues; you may need to look at those on a broader basis than CAB; you may want to work these together with other agencies seeking information on the same issues. Suggest having public meeting combined with CAB meeting to help gather information. Also, this is a major turning point for CAB to begin to get ahead of the issues - this is a great approach. As you get into the broad policy decisions, it will be much harder to get consensus. When you can't, it's important for us still to have this brought to the public and discussed. We get out of that at least the range of views and coverage of the issues. That's still very valuable.
- EPA: Waste disposal policy for Rocky Flats is a high priority. On-site disposal needs to be prioritized above off-site disposal, as there could be significant cost savings and this could be an ultimate solution. QAT believes that since retrievable disposal cells could be built for one-third the cost of the solar ponds closure, it may be

worthwhile to consider monitored/retrievable disposal options making final decision on the solar ponds. Also, CAB's comments on RFCA Rev.7a are important to have immediately. Other priorities: need more emphasis on mortgage reduction; need CAB's input on deactivation and decommissioning criteria.

- DOE: Would like CAB to come to a decision on waste disposal issue - this drives planning and assumptions all across the site. This will also determine how to deal with some remediation issues. This is the overriding priority; would like decision fairly soon.
- Rather than calling them priority levels, use "terminal objectives" for priority level one issues, and "enabling objectives" for all other priorities. Also, consolidation of plutonium and liquid stabilization should be under priority level two.
- It's doesn't do much good to make recommendations if the funding is taken away before anything can be done.
- Come up with general priorities, looking from the angle of mortgage reduction and making the plutonium safe. We're not being proactive enough.
- General/broad issues are what's holding back CAB in decision-making. The priorities also need to be broad and general.
- Need to make sure that citizen input is included, and to involve people more.
- This is a proactive prioritization of issues. Developing a general policy will be a big step toward leading ourselves in a particular direction and should help with other decisions. All of these issues will last longer than specific budgets or political regimes. Our job is to tell DOE what the community wants based on our representation.
- There are some near-term things that will happen and we should consider them on an as-needed basis.
- There are degrees of being proactive. Some of these things need to be decided on quickly, and there may not be time for all the input you'd like. We may need to rely on guidelines such as those developed at the Summit.
- Might consider reorganizing our operations at the committee level. We could streamline the process further to be more efficient and do a better job of sharing information.

Public comment: Suggest that Plutonium and Special Nuclear Materials Committee also review the question of consolidation. Money is being spent preparing Building 371, and assumptions are being made that waste will be put into this building. Need a broader conversation about alternative places for interim storage - other buildings or areas off-site.

Action: Have committees develop an action plan/approach for dealing with the four priority level one issues for discussion at the Board retreat on June 25. Committee assignments will be as recommended by staff.

POLICY ON BOARD COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION:

Some CAB members did not agree with this policy; it was decided to discuss this issue at the next meeting.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: June 1, 1995, 6 - 9:30 p.m.

Location: Westminster City Hall, Multi-Purpose Room

Agenda: Update on Solar Ponds Closure; Recommendation on FY 96 Budget Reallocation; Recommendation of New Board Members; Committee Membership and Participation

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:

- 1) Give any additional comments on Future Site Use Plan to Alternative Use Planning Committee - by June 20; or attend next committee meeting on May 23 - All Board members
- 2) Forward Summit recommendation to DOE/EPA/CDPHE - Staff
- 3) Submit expense reports to Deb Thompson - by May 15 - All Board members
- 4) Begin preparations for public meeting on plutonium vitrification - Staff
- 5) Develop action plan/approach on CAB policy/cleanup levels - by June 25 - E/WM Committee
- 6) Develop action plan/approach on CAB waste disposal policy - by June 25 - Site Wide Issues Committee
- 7) Develop action plan/approach on CAB policy/plutonium disposition by June 25 - Plutonium and SNM Committee
- 8) Develop action plan/approach on CAB policy/future use - by June 25 - Alternative Use Planning Committee

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:32 P.M.

* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in CAB office.

MINUTES APPROVED BY:

Secretary, Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

Question: What is being done to break the logjam - barriers to moving the waste away from Rocky Flats, or should we be considering long-term storage at Rocky Flats?

Answer: Nothing has been done to break the logjam; it may be something we face for a long time. Our considerations on what to do with waste also include whether or not it should be moved off-site, and whether there will be any place to move it to. We're not sure if WIPP will open on time; NTS can only take low-level waste; and DOE/RFFO does not intend to send waste to Yucca Mountain.

The Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board is a community advisory group that reviews and provides recommendations on cleanup plans for Rocky Flats, a former nuclear weapons plant outside of Denver, Colorado.

[Top of Page](#) | [Index of Meeting Minutes](#) | [Home](#)

[Citizens Advisory Board Info](#) | [Rocky Flats Info](#) | [Links](#) | [Feedback & Questions](#)